



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	*	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,095	03/29/2001	Juan G. Revilla	<u> २०००</u>	10559-395001 / P10620-ADI	8397
20985	7590 04/08/2004			EXAMINER	
FISH & RIC			DANG, KHANH NMN		
	, CA 92130-2081		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
5.1. · 5 = 5 · 5				2111	9
				DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SL

,	Application N .	Applicant(s)	X
Advisory Action	09/823,095	REVILLA ET AL.	0-
, avice. y rieue	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Khanh Dang	2111	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondenc add	ress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	 a timely filed amendment whi 	cation. A proper repich places the application	cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of	· ·		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The danave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the state of the shortened by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterarned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. Solution 136(a) and the appropriate existence from the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	` ' ——	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		to issues which we	re newly
 7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w 			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8 and 17-20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. Other:		mars D	no
		Khanh Dan Primary Exam	•

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Garibay, Jr. et al., as explained in the Final Rejection and specifically discussed under "Response to Arguments", disclose the claimed invention. In addition, in response to Applicant After-Final argument, Garibay, Jr. et al. does NOT use a single bit to represent each of the mulitiple different kinds of exceptions. In fact, according to Garibay, Jr. et al., the instruction byte is invalidated by clearing a valid bit.